ISO DEFS.' MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF STANDING

Two Embarcadero Cente 11th Floor

San Francisco, CA 9411 (415) 592-3209

Case 8:13-cv-01480-GHK-DFM Document 113 Filed 03/11/15 Page 1 of 3 Page ID #:3404

- 2 3
- 4
- 5 6

7

- 8
- 9 10
- 11
- 12
- 13 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18

19

- 20
- 21
- 22 23
- 24
- 25 26
- 27 28

- I, D. James Pak, declare as follows:
- I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice law in the State of California with the law firm of Baker & McKenzie LLP, counsel for Defendants Hyundai Motor America, Hyundai Motor Company, Kia Motors America Inc., and Kia Motors Corporation (collectively "Defendants"). I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein, and if called upon to testify, I would be competent to do so under oath.
- 2. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 39** is a true and correct copy of a December 29, 2014, 10:44 AM CST email from Colin Watterson, counsel for Plaintiff Diamond Coating Technologies, sent to all counsel in *Diamond Coating Technologies*, LLC. v. Hyundai Motor America, et al., Case No. 8-13-cv-01480 MRP (DFMx).
- Attached hereto as **Exhibit 40** is a true and correct copy of a January 13, 2015, 12:12 AM CST email from Colin Watterson, counsel for Plaintiff Diamond Coating Technologies, sent to all counsel in *Diamond Coating Technologies*, LLC. v. Hyundai Motor America, et al., Case No. 8-13-cv-01480 MRP (DFMx).
- 4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 41** is a true and correct copy of a Febraury 9, 2015, 11:58 AM CST email from Colin Watterson, counsel for Plaintiff Diamond Coating Technologies, sent to all counsel in Diamond Coating Technologies, LLC. v. Hyundai Motor America, et al., Case No. 8-13-cv-01480 MRP (DFMx).
- 5. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Standing was made following a conference of counsel pursuant to L.R. 7-3 which took place on January 26-28, 2015. Counsel for DCT and Defendants corresponded via e-mail on January 26-27, 2015 and by telephone on January 28, 2015, regarding Sanyo Electric Co., Inc. ("Sanyo") (now doing business as Panasonic Corporation) as an indispensable party, but could not reach an agreement.
- More particularly, in an e-mail dated January 26, 2015, Defendants informed DCT of its intention to move to dismiss the litigation based on Sanyo's status as an indispensible party. Decl. of D. James Pak at Ex. 37, ECF No. 91-37.

DCT responded to the e-mail informing Defendants that "DCT disagrees with most everything in [Defendants'] email." Id.

- During the parties' telephone conference on January 28, 2015, 7. Defendants informed DCT of their intention to move to dismiss this action for lack of standing or, in the alternative, to join Sanyo as a necessary party.
- 8. On the call, Defendants were prepared to explain in detail the basis for the lack of standing, which would have included the issue of champerty. The parties, however, concluded that a detailed discussion was not necessary as DCT stated that it disagreed that it lacked standing.
- At the close of the call, DCT confirmed its agreement that Defendants 9. fully complied with their duty to meet and confer under L.R. 7-3, even in the absence of a detailed discussion.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on March 11, 2015 in San Francisco, California.

Dated: March 11, 2015 BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP

> By: /s/ D. James Pak D. James Pak

Attorneys for Defendants Hyundai Motor America, Hyundai Motor Company, Kia Motors America, Inc. and Kia Motors Corporation